

## **REMARKS**

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated July 27, 2006, in which Claims 1-16 were rejected. Claims 8-16 have been canceled; and Claim 1 has been amended. Accordingly, Claims 1-7 are pending in the application, and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claims 1-7 was objected to due to informalities. Claim 1 has been amended and is believed to overcome the objections stated by the Examiner.

Claims 1-16, stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Pub. No. 2005/0225232 (*Boroson*). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to clearly set forth the invention and to overcome the Examiner's objection to claim 1 on the grounds that it was unclear. In amended claim 1, a reflector and a semi-transparent reflector form a microcavity for providing red, green or blue light that is normal to the substrate. Resonated light is produced in Boroson et al. but not in regions adjacent to Boroson et al.'s semi-transparent reflector. Therefore, any light produced in regions adjacent to Boroson et al. that passes into Boroson et al.'s semi-transparent reflector and that passes between the color filters is unresonated. Any resonated light produced by Boroson et al. that passes through the semi-transparent reflector and the spaces between the color filter elements must be at an angle to the substrate, and would not be normal to the substrate. Furthermore, in Claim 1 as amended, the first color filter element is disposed relative to a first portion of a semi-transparent reflector and does not cover a second portion of the semi-transparent reflector. Boroson et al.'s filter covers the entire semi-transparent reflector. Therefore, all normal resonated light in Boroson et al. must pass through the color filter element and therefore is filtered.

Applicant has made a sincere attempt to correct any informalities in claim 1 and to clearly point out the differences between claim 1 and the disclosure in Boroson et al. Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), Boroson et al. is not a reference.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there were any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Paul R. L.', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/djw  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: 585-477-4653  
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.